

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
June 15, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Brittain, Grube

ABSENT: Connor, Feldman, Garza

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
- Rehabber Club June Meeting - 1901 S Alamo - Thursday, June 23 - 5:30 PM - Landscaping Proposed River Improvement Overlay District (RIO-7), draft document now available at <http://spcproject.org>. Comments can be sent to cory@sapreservation.com through August 31.
- Citizens to be heard

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-197 | 2042 W Gramercy Place |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2015-303 | 310 W Mitchell St |
| • Item # 3, Case No. 2016-200 | 350 Hoefgen Ave/Amtrak |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-207 | 414 Atlanta Ave |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-219 | 622 S Flores St |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-218 | 127 E Mulberry Ave |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-217 | 117 E French Place |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-214 | 200 W Jones Ave |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-210 | 317 Lamar St |
| • Item # 10 Case No. 2016-204 | 136 E Grayson St |
| • Item # 11 Case No. 2016-097 | 3700 N St Marys, Brackenridge Park |
| • Item # 12 Case No. 2016-144 | 3100 Roosevelt Ave |
| • Item # 13 Case No. 2016-201 | 722 S St Marys |
| • Item # 14 Case No. 2016-211 | 529 Mason St |
| • Item # 15 Case No. 2016-202 | 800 E Guenther St |

Items #2, #11, were pulled for Recusal. Item #13 was pulled for a citizen to be heard.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Brittain to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Salmon, Brittain, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

2. HDRC NO. 2015-303

Applicant: Melissa Rodriguez

Address: 310 W MITCHELL ST

June 15, 2016

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval for Confluence Park to include:

1. Gathering education pavilion of concrete form
2. 3 small pavilions
3. large water catchment system
4. Surface parking
5. Paved walkways
6. Multi-purpose building with solar panels and green roof
7. Five planting ecotype demonstrations
8. 67' x 7'-6" sign with reverse channel letters on corten steel flanked by concrete walls

FINDINGS:

- a. This request received conceptual approval by the HDRC on August 5, 2015, with the stipulations that an archeology investigation be required and that the applicant coordinate with the San Antonio River Authority regarding storm water control measures, access to parks, landscaping and maintenance boundaries.
- b. The park's primary mission of environmental education, interactive learning and recreation, serve to promote and encourage neighborhood and cultural tourism. The park will be constructed on currently vacant land located at 310 W. Mitchell Street, with views and direct pedestrian connections to the river.
- c. The main gathering pavilion, three smaller pavilions, and the multi-purpose room relate to the pedestrian scale as required by UDC Section 35-670(b). The pavilions are made of exposed concrete petals that create the support and coverings. The multi-purpose room is a one story building with concrete siding with four 2' x 2' red cedar slats on the front façade near the pedestrian entrance, with a green roof, four skylights, and solar panels to be installed on the roof. The south and east elevations of the building will be hidden from view as the landscaping will be on these sides growing up to the roof to create a vegetated roof.
- d. Per UDC Section 35-672(c), an architectural focal point shall be incorporated in to the design of a structure located at a prominent curve in the river or at a prominent intersection where the street appears to terminate. The applicant has proposed a main gathering pavilion which serves as an architectural focal point for the proposed park. This is consistent with the UDC.
- e. These proposed walkways, materials, and site plan are consistent UDC Section 35-672, as they relate to general pedestrian circulation, use of appropriate paving materials, maintaining street connections to the river, providing unobstructed pedestrian access along the Riverwalk, creating automobile access and parking, maintaining prominent views and in providing an architectural focal point. The proposed paving materials include a combination of clay unit pavers with custom concrete pavers requiring four different fabricated molds. This is consistent with UDC 35-673 (g).
- f. The park's primary pedestrian and automobile access is located off Mitchell Street with connecting walkways to the Riverwalk. The parking surface will be composed of a combination of brick pavers and gravel, accessed by a curb cut fronting Mitchell Street. This is consistent with the UDC regarding pedestrian circulation, access to the Riverwalk, and parking areas made with pervious materials.
- g. The UDC Section 35-673(c) provides guidelines regarding the preservation of the existing natural contours and distinct character of the San Antonio River. Staff finds the proposal is consistent with this section. The applicant is responsible for complying with this section of the UDC as well as additional coordination with the San Antonio River Authority.
- h. Generally the proposed park is consistent with the Site Design Standards described in UDC Section 35-673, as they relate to appropriate building orientation, topography and draining, retaining walls, riverside setbacks, landscape design and plant materials, paving materials, street furnishings, lighting, access to public pathway along the river and bicycle parking.
- i. The applicant is proposing to install a 67' x 7'-6" sign with reverse channel letters on corten steel flanked by concrete walls. The proposed sign area is 107.5 square feet. The UDC Sec 35-678 (e) states that applicants may have up to fifty (50) square feet total unless additional total footage is approved by the HDRC; the additional footage shall be based upon the size and scope of the site. Staff finds the large lot size and the use of the space warrant additional square footage based on the large size of the lot.
- j. The property is within the River Improvement Overlay District and is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX257 and 41BX12. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. Furthermore, this project falls under the Texas Antiquities Code and will require an Antiquities Permit with the Texas Historical Commission prior to the commencement of construction efforts.

June 15, 2016

k. This address falls within the buffer zone of the designated World Heritage areas as well as the Mission Protection Overlay. The applicant is responsible for complying with all regulations and meeting any design standards associated with these designations and zonings

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on the findings a through k with the following stipulation:

1. An archaeological investigation is required..

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Salmon to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Salmon, Brittain, Cone, Grube

NAYS:

Recusal: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

11. HDRC NO. 2016-204

Applicant: Stan Albus/Rialto Studio, Inc

Address: 3700 N ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the repair and renovations of specific park features at Brackenridge Park that were constructed between 1915 and 1937. These park features include park entry monuments, Dionicio Rodriguez Sculptures and public restrooms located on N St Marys.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant received conceptual approval on March 16, 2016, with the stipulations that none of the interior restroom modifications impact the exterior façade or façade elements, that the lighting fixtures at the Koehler gates are repaired and retained and that no original stone materials are removed, but that they are repaired and restored in place.

b. Currently, there are two entry monuments at the N St Mary's entrance near the San Antonio Zoo that were constructed circa 1915, two at the Avenue B entrance on Broadway constructed circa 1930 and two at the Tuleta entrance on Broadway constructed circa 1935. Each of these monuments is unique and feature different design sand elements such as decorative metal work, roof structures and lighting. Each of these entry monuments have some degree of stone masonry decay and are in need of repair. The applicant has noted that all stone materials and wrought iron materials are to be repaired and restored except the capitals of each monument and select pieces of stone. The applicant has noted that the capitals are to match identically to the original and that the new cut stone pieces are to match. Staff recommends the applicant provide example of the proposed replacement stone.

c. There are four Dionicio Rodriguez sculptures located within Brackenridge Park, each constructed circa 1920. These pieces include the Upper Labor Acequia Bridge, the Palap Bench, the Palapa Table and the Hollow Tree Bench. Each of these sculptures are showing weather related damage. Previously each of these items were repaired, many in the 1960's and the bridge in 2003 and since each of these elements have experienced cracking and damage. The applicant has proposed to repair each of these sculptures, restoring their original finish and integrity. This is consistent with the UDC Section 35-676.

d. There are two restroom structures located along N St Marys which were constructed circa 1920 after the dedication of Otto Koehler Park. Both of these structures are structurally sound, however, do not comply with Texas Accessibility Standards and are in disrepair. Both structures will undergo interior improvements as well as roof replacement to match the existing and minor cosmetic repairs. This is consistent with the UDC.

e. In regards to landscaping, the applicant has noted that at the restroom locations along N St Marys, new concrete pavers are to be installed for continuity and that the existing concrete pavers will be repaired to all be consistent. Repair work over time has left many irregular replacement pavers in place. These are to be removed. Additionally, the applicant has noted that proper trimming and maintenance to landscaping materials will occur at the time of the stone restoration.

f. **ARCHEOLOGY** – The professional working on this project must be a Certified Faux Bois Specialist.

June 15, 2016

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through e with the stipulations that the applicant provide more information on which stones need to be replaced and what stone replacement materials will be installed and that the professional working on this project must be a Certified Faux Bois Specialist.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations

AYES: Lazarine, Laffoon, Salmon, Brittain, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

Recusal: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

13. HDRC NO. 2016-201

Applicant: Jill Giles

Address: 722 S ST MARYS

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install signage at El Mirador at 722 S St Mary's that includes the following:

1. One (1) scaffolding mounted channel letter with tab drop shadows to read "El Mirador". The face of the letters and returns are to be a gradient and slight metallic paint along the center of the letters. This sign is to be 15' – 7" in length and 4' – 11" in height featuring a size of approximately 78 square feet.
2. One (1) parapet mounted sign to read "Comida Mex" to be 6' – 9" in length and 8.5" in height. The applicant has proposed for this sign to consist of either channel letters or open channel letters with exposed neon lighting. This sign is to be below the proposed "El Mirador" signage. This sign is to feature a size of approximately five square feet

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 722 S St Mary's currently features two existing signs; one wall mounted sign reading "El Mirador" and one pole sign at the public right of way reading "El Mirador, Est. 1968 and Authentic Mexican Home Cooking". The applicant has proposed to remove both of these signs.
- b. Above the location of the existing wall signage, the applicant has proposed to install one (1) scaffolding mounted metal channel letters with tab drop shadows to read "El Mirador". The face of the letters and returns are to be a gradient and slight metallic paint along the center of the letters. This sign is to be 15' – 7" in length and 4' – 11" in height featuring a size of approximately 78 square feet. The applicant has noted that this sign is to be lit by existing up lighting.
- c. According to the Guidelines for Signage, 1.A., each building is allowed one major and two minor signs not to exceed fifty (50) square feet in size, signs should be designed in a manner that is architecturally appropriate for the structure for which they represent and sign should be appropriate scaled for the structure. Staff finds that the applicant has proposed signage which is appropriate in scale and design although this proposed sign is approximately 78 square feet in size. S St Marys Street, particularly in the vicinity of 722 S St Mary's is commercial in nature featuring more than fifty (50) square feet in size.
- d. Below the proposed "El Mirado" signage, the applicant has proposed one (1) parapet mounted sign to read "Comida Mex" to be 6' – 9" in length and 8.5" in height. The applicant has proposed for this sign to consist of either channel letters or open channel letters with exposed neon lighting. This sign is to be below the proposed "El Mirador" signage. This sign is to feature a size of approximately five square feet.
- e. According the Guidelines for Signage, C, signs should not be erected above the cornice line or uppermost portion of a façade wall or where they will disfigure or conceal architectural details. Additionally, signage should be oriented toward the sidewalk to maintain the pedestrian oriented nature of historic districts. The applicant has proposed to mount the signage to scaffolding that is to be attached to the roof or parapet wall. Staff finds the

June 15, 2016

applicant's proposal to mount the scaffolding to the parapet wall appropriate and for the signage location itself located slightly above and in front of the western wall of the non-historic structure appropriate.

f. Per the UDC Section 28-6, a wall sign is classified as signage that is fastened to, or painted on the wall of a building or structure in such a manner that the wall becomes the supporting structure or forms the background surface of the sign and which does not project more than twelve (12) inches from the building or structure. Also per the UDC Section 28-6, a roof sign shall mean a sign that is mounted on and is wholly supported by the roof of a building and which projects above the point of a building with a flat roof, the cave line of a building with a gambrel, gable, or hip roof, or the deck of a building with a mansard roof. Given the applicant's proposal to mount the proposed sign's mounting brackets to the parapet wall, staff finds that the proposed sign is a wall sign and appropriate. Additionally, staff finds that no part of the proposed signage is to be mounted to the roof as this would constitute roof mounted signage.

g. In regards to materials, signs should be constructed of durable materials such as wrought iron, steel, aluminum and metal grill work. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines for Signage 1.D.ii.

h. The applicant has proposed to light the "El Mirador" sign by external up lighting only. The applicant has proposed for the "Comida Mex" sign to be lit by neon lighting. According to the Guidelines for Signage 6.E.i., neon lighting should be incorporated as an integral architectural element or artwork appropriate for the site. The applicant has noted that the neon lighting would be exposed. Staff finds the proposed lighting source appropriate, however, recommends the applicant provide an additional detail on the final appearance of the lighting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through h.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Salmon, Brittain, Cone, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

16. HDRC NO. 2016-180

Applicant: EJ Lee

Address: 3220 MISSION RD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace 7 aluminum windows with single hung aluminum windows with divided lights
2. Replace 5 wood windows with single hung aluminum windows with divided lights
3. Replace 2 wooden interior-style doors with exterior steel doors
4. Replace 2 wooden interior-style door with solid steel doors
5. Cover existing side-facing wooden front door with siding to match existing siding
6. Replace stone and stucco siding with Hardiplank on rear façade of main structure

FINDINGS:

a. The request was heard by the HDRC on May 18, 2016, where commissioners expressed concerns that the work was done prior to approval and that the windows and doors in place were not appropriate. At the hearing, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee to discuss solutions.

b. The request was heard by the Design Review Committee on June 8, 2016, where the commissioner expressed concerns for the loss of the original steel casement and wood windows and the safety issues of the back house. It was suggested that re-installing the original windows would be ideal, or if replacement was not feasible then installing the windows with a 2 inch inset to create a profile and removing the divided lights. It was also suggested that front door be replaced with something simpler and without a fan light. The commissioner was in support of the hardie siding to replace the stucco if of the same dimension as the existing wood siding.

June 15, 2016

c. The applicant received administrative approval to paint siding, trim, and door, remove non-historic carport and repair existing metal roof.

d. The windows and doors were replaced prior to receiving approval. The applicant has since submitted all documents required.

e. The applicant is proposing to replace 7 aluminum and 5 wood windows with new aluminum windows with divided lights and inset two inches. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond repair, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. In this case, there are original windows in place, as noted in the window schedule, and should guide the selection of the replacement product. Staff finds the proposed two-inch inset appropriate, but finds the aluminum and divided lights inconsistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that windows that were historically installed be re-installed, either wood windows with one over one configuration without divided lights or steel casement windows would be appropriate.

f. The applicant is proposing to replace the two front non-historic doors, one on the front house and one on the back house, with steel doors painted to look like wood. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds the proposed door to be appropriate in style, but that the material is inconsistent with the Guidelines and recommends the front door be replaced with a door made of wood.

g. The applicant is proposing to replace two non-historic doors with solid steel doors. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds the style appropriate, but that the material is inconsistent with the Guidelines and recommends the front door be replaced with a door made of wood.

h. The applicant is proposing to remove existing side-facing front wooden exterior door, seal the door opening and cover with siding to match existing. This is inconsistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i., which states that existing window and door openings should be preserved.

i. The applicant is proposing to remove stucco and faux stone on the existing addition on the right façade and replace with hardieplank fiber cement lap siding. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 2., stucco should be removed where not historically appropriate; however, the Guidelines state that Hardiboard is not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial of items #1 through #6 based on findings a through i. Staff recommends that the windows be replaced with windows that are historically appropriate, the replacement doors be made of wood and that the non-historic stucco siding be replaced with wood siding to match existing.

CASE COMMENT:

HDRC 5/18/16

DRC 6/8/16

Applicant Withdrew Request

17. HDRC NO. 2016-222

Applicant: James Schuepbach

Address: 1334 S FLORES ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is seeking a Historic and Design Review Commission recommendation to remove historic designation from the property at 1334 S Flores.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 1334 S Flores St was designated as a historic landmark by Ordinance 68210 on October 27, 1988.

June 15, 2016

- b. The property owner submitted a request for removal of historic designation. Consistent with the UDC Sec 35-606(g), the applicant must present new and compelling evidence that the property no longer meets the criteria for landmark designation.
- c. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(1), the property at 1334 S Flores serves as a distinctive visible reminder of the cultural heritage of San Antonio related to the advent of the railroad and associated industrial development.
- d. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(6), as the last warehouse constructed in the 1300 and 1400 blocks of South Flores, the property represents a unique example of a midcentury commercial structure.
- e. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(8), the property maintains a high level of integrity with very minor alterations over time.
- f. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(11), Watts Hardware succeeded Peden Iron & Steel in the early 1930s as the local distributor for a large number of merchandise lines including appliances, tires, and lighting. The company continued to grow and thrive over time, occupying several buildings in the 1300 and 1400 blocks of South Flores over nearly thirty years.
- g. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(13), the property is surrounded by historic warehouses, several of which were also used by Watts Hardware and Peden Iron & Steel, dating back to the early twentieth century. The proximity of the railroad depot along South Alamo provided convenient access for these merchants to raw materials and merchandise from across the country.

RECOMMENDATION:

In the absence of new and compelling evidence, staff finds that the property remains eligible for designation based on findings c through h and recommends denial of the request to remove the historic designation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Brittain for denial.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2016-221

Applicant: Mary Radicke

Address: 255 BRAHAN BLVD

REQUEST:

A citizen request for the HDRC to make a recommendation regarding the significance of the property and its eligibility for designation as a historic landmark.

FINDINGS:

- a. A request for review of historic significance for 255 Brahan was submitted to OHP by Mary Radicke.
- b. Consistent with the RID 2014-003, OHP processed the request and scheduled on the HDRC agenda. If the HDRC does not take action to nominate the property for historic designation, the process will end.
- c. The HDRC may concur that the property is eligible for landmark designation without the consent of the property owner. According to the UDC Section 35-607(a) & (b)(1), initiation of landmark designation cannot begin without owner consent, unless a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation has been approved. If 255 Brahan is found to be eligible for historic landmark designation and the property owner does not consent, the HDRC shall direct the Historic Preservation Officer to request a City Council resolution to proceed with the designation.
- d. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(3), the property was purchased by Otto Wahrmond on July 8, 1913 from Susan E. Pfeuffer. Wahrmond served as the president, vice president, and general manager of the San Antonio Brewing Association (Pearl Brewery). Wahrmond's daughter and son-in-law, Charles T. and Jennie Boelhauwe, lived in the home. From 1928 to 1933, Dr. Charles T. Venable lived in the home. Dr. Venable was a leader in the medical field, instrumental in the establishment of the Lee Surgical Hospital, San Antonio Free Clinic, and the

June 15, 2016

local Red Cross chapter. He served as president of the Texas Surgical Society, the Bexar County Medical Society, and the Texas Medical Association.

e. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(4), the property is associated with Charles T. Boelhauwe, local architect known for his work on the Central Trust Company building (1919) in downtown San Antonio and the Sunken Gardens Theater expansion in 1937. Boelhauwe designed the home and he and his wife Jennie Wahrmond Boelhauwe were its first residents.

f. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(5), the property is a large double-dormer Craftsman bungalow with folk Victorian influences. The wide roof overhang, exposed rafter tails and triangular knee braces, and gabled dormers are characteristic of the Craftsman style. While some alterations are evident, it retains a high level of integrity.

g. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(7), the property's location on a double lot at a prominent corner of a broad boulevard with central promenade establishes the home as a distinctive visual feature of the neighborhood.

h. Consistent with the UDC sec. 35-607(b)(13), the structure is one of the two oldest remaining structures on Brahan Blvd. Two older homes have been demolished, and the Cain House at 320 Brahan appeared in the City Directory in the same year as 255 Brahan, 1916.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff concurs that the property is eligible for designation based on findings d through i. If the HDRC chooses to approve the request, the HDRC will become the applicant for the designation application before City Council. OHP shall process the application on behalf of the HDRC.

CASE COMMENT:

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD:

Susan Beavin, G. Burnette, Julie Gibson, & Carla Zainie, all spoke in support of the historic landmark designation. Victor Vandyk & James Mcknight spoke in opposition of the historic landmark designation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The property owner submitted a demolition application for 255 Brahan on March 24, 2016.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

19. HDRC NO. 2016-215

Applicant: Jeffrey Ryan/Jackson & Ryan Architects

Address: 315 W JONES AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a new central utility plant that is to be a one story brick structure to feature approximately 3,000 square feet.

FINDINGS:

a. The construction of a central utility plant as well as other repair and maintenance items were reviewed by the Design Review Committee on May 23, 2016, where committee members noted the proposed materials were appropriate as well as other maintenance related items.

b. **PEDESTRIAN ACCESS** – Per the UDC Section 35-672(a) in regards to pedestrian circulation, an applicant shall provide pedestrian access among properties to integrate neighborhoods. The applicant has proposed to maintain the existing sidewalk at the public right of way at W Jones. This is consistent with the UDC.

c. **CURB CUTS** – Per the provided site plan, the applicant has proposed to maintain the existing curb cut. Staff finds

June 15, 2016

this appropriate.

d. **PARKING** – Regarding onsite parking, surface parking areas are to be located toward the interior of the site or to the side or rear of a building and shall be screened or buffered from view of public streets and the San Antonio River if they are located within a fifty-foot setback from the edge of the river ROW use and within a twenty-foot setback from a property line adjacent to a street use. The applicant has proposed to locate onsite parking to the rear of the proposed new construction at the overall rear of the lot. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the UDC.

e. **ENTRANCE ORIENTATION** – The UDC Section 35-673(b)(1)(A) both state that a building's orientation as well as primary entrance should be toward the street. The applicant has oriented the structure's façade to be in a manner comparable to other structures along W Jones. Staff finds that given the service nature of this structure, an entrance along W Jones at the public right of way not be appropriate. The applicant has located pedestrian entrances on the west façade, maintaining a pedestrian scale. This is appropriate.

f. **BUFFERING & SCREENING** – Per the UDC Section 35-673(m) and (n), Buffering and Screening should be used to screen various mechanical and service equipment from the public right of way. Along W Jones, the applicant has proposed a decorative metal fence to act as a screening element to screen various service equipment from the public right of way. While staff finds the proposed method of screening appropriate, staff recommends the applicant provide additional information for the proposed fence including its overall height.

g. **SCALE** – According to the UDC Section 35-674 (b), a building shall appear to have a "human scale" which can be achieved by the expression of façade components, the aligning of horizontal building elements with others in the block face, the distinction between upper and lower floors and the division of the façade into modules that express traditional dimensions. The applicant has proposed to separate the proposed façade into a base, midsection and a capital. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials to include limestone, brick to match the museum's brick, zinc parapet coping, zinc panel siding galvanized steel plate canopies and steel doors. These materials are consistent with the UDC.

i. **CANOPIES** – According to the UDC Section 35-674(g), awnings and canopies are to be used to accentuate the character defining features of the building. The applicant has applied the proposed awnings to separate the façade as well as provide a reference to the building's entrances. This is consistent with the UDC.

j. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The project is within the River Improvement Overlay District and is adjacent to the original alignment of the San Antonio River. In addition, the property is in close proximity to previously recorded archaeological sites 41BX1817 and 41BX1913. Therefore, archaeological investigations are required. The applicant shall coordinate the archaeology scope of work with the OHP prior to the commencement of construction activities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through j with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant reduced the height of the proposed fence to no more than six (6) feet in height.
- ii. Archaeological investigations are required.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval of 6' fence along Jones & 8' along perimeter.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2016-208

Applicant: Hilton Crocker

Address: 2010 W MAGNOLIA AVE

June 15, 2016

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to remove existing ribbon driveway and replace with 9' wide full driveway with no changes to the apron.

FINDINGS:

- a. This home is located in Phase 5 of the Monticello Park Historic District, which was designated May 16, 2010.
- b. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing ribbon driveway, made of two 2' concrete strips, separated by grass, and repour a 9' wide concrete driveway. The Guidelines for Site Elements state that historic driveways are typically no wider than 10' and that new driveway configurations should be similar to what's historically found in the district. Staff made a site visit on June 6, 2016, and found that driveways in Monticello Park Historic District historically are 10' wide.
- c. The Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.i. also states that pervious paving surfaces may be considered when replacement is necessary.
- d. Ribbon driveways are character defining features of the property. Staff recommends that the applicant re-pour the historic driveway ribbon configuration and consider using a pervious material such as decomposed granite in the middle and to widen if necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial based on findings a through d. Staff recommends that the applicant repour the ribbon driveway in the same configuration as existing, and widen with pervious material up to 10'.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for conceptual approval of revised ribbon drive way to be adjusted to the left side & symmetrical to the apron. The applicant must return with more documentation of details for staff approval.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2016-203

Applicant: Jorge Araujo

Address: 431 ADAMS ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Demolish an existing, non-contributing rear accessory structure.
2. Replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof.
3. Construct a new, two story accessory structure.

FINDINGS:

- a. The structure at 431 Adams was constructed circa 1920, is located at the corner of Adams Street and Barbe Street and features craftsman style elements. The applicant has proposed to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof with a standing seam metal roof. This roofing modification is architecturally appropriate for the craftsman style as well as the King William Historic District. The applicant should ensure that panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width should be used, that seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, that a crimped ridge seam that's historically appropriate be used, that a low profile ridge cap be used and that a galvalume finish be used; manufacturer's colors are not recommended.
- b. The southern corner of the lot at the intersection of Barbe Street and Wickes Street currently features a noncontributing accessory structure, constructed circa 1980. The applicant has proposed to demolish this structure. Staff finds this demolition appropriate.

June 15, 2016

c. **MASSING & FORM** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i, new accessory structures should be designed to be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of their height, massing and form. The primary historic structure at 431 Adams features a single story with a foundation height of approximately two feet and an overall height of 21' – 0". The applicant has proposed to construct an accessory structure to include two levels and an overall height of 23' – 1 ½". In terms of height, while the proposed structure is slightly taller than the primary historic structure, staff finds its height is generally appropriate in context with other accessory structures along both Adams and Barbe.

d. **BUILDING SIZE** – The applicant has proposed an overall building size of approximately 1,000 square feet. The primary historic structure features a footprint of approximately 1,500 square feet. The applicant's proposed building size is neither appropriate for the lot at 431 Adams nor is it consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction. Staff recommends that the applicant reduce the overall footprint of the proposed structure to less than forty (40) percent of the primary historic structure's footprint.

e. **CHARACTER** – New accessory structures should relate to the period or construction of the primary historic structure on the lot through the use of contemporary materials and simplified architectural details. Elements that should relate are façade materials, roofing materials, window and door openings and materials and overall architectural form.

f. **CHARACTER** – At this time, the applicant has proposed façade materials to include Hardi Board siding and brick consistent with the brick of the primary historic structure. The applicant however has proposed for vertically oriented siding for the accessory structure and has included craftsman style architectural elements on a structure that features a vertically oriented siding. This is architecturally inappropriate.

g. **WINDOWS & DOORS** – The applicant has noted that the accessory structure is to feature aluminum windows that are to match the profile of the windows found in the primary historic structure. Staff finds that wood windows would be more appropriate. Each window should be inset within walls at least (2) inches. In regards to window placement, the applicant has proposed for the accessory structure to include walls that at times are void of fenestration of façade separation. This is neither appropriate nor consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the applicant propose fenestration patterns that provide façade separation and negate long expanses of blank walls.

h. **GARAGE DOORS** – In regards to the proposed garage doors, the applicant has not noted a specific material, however, staff finds that the applicant should study existing garage door found throughout the district that are architecturally contributing.

i. **ORIENTATION** – According to the Guidelines, the predominant garage orientation found along the block should be matched. Corner lots found along Barbe Street feature a primary structure orientation toward the intersecting streets while the accessory structure's orientation is toward Barbe. The applicant's proposed orientation is consistent with the Guidelines.

j. **SETBACKS** – Per the Guidelines, the historic setback pattern of similar accessory structures along the streetscape should be followed. The applicant has noted compliance with setback requirements while using a similar setback found throughout the district. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding b.

Staff recommends approval of item #2 based on finding a.

Staff does not recommend final approval at this time of item #3 based on findings c through j. Staff recommends conceptual approval of the applicant's proposed setbacks and orientation. Staff recommends the applicant address the following prior to returning to the HDRC:

1. That the applicant reduce the proposed massing and footprint of the proposed accessory structure to be more appropriate for the primary historic structure.
2. That the address the architectural inconsistencies including siding orientation and the proposed garage doors.
3. That the applicant provide information in regards to the proposed windows including their installation.
4. That the applicant introduce additional windows or make other design changes to reduce the overall lack of fenestration.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD:

Cherise Bell spoke in opposition of the applicants request.

June 15, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval of items #1 & #2 , conceptual approval of item # 3 with the stipulation that the applicant return for final approval.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone , Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

22. HDRC NO. 2016-220

Applicant: Gustavo Mendoza/Smartworld Energy Inc

Address: 201 DELAWARE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install 24 solar panels on the west and east slopes of the hipped roof.

FINDINGS:

- a. The Lavaca Historic District was designated June 10th, 2004.
- b. The applicant submitted a request for solar panels at 201 Delaware, heard by the HDRC on April 20, 2016. The commission denied the request for 20 solar panels to be installed on the slope facing Staffel Street and four to be installed on the pitch facing the interior of the lot.
- c. The applicant has proposed to install 24 solar panels on the standing seam metal roof of the primary structure. 11 panels will be installed on the slope facing the interior of the lot and 13 panels will be installed on the slope facing Staffel Street. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C., installations should be in locations that minimize visibility from the public right-of-way.
- d. Staff visited the site on April 13, 2016, and found that house is on a corner lot interior to the historic district and that the panels will be highly visible from the public right-of-way on the front and side. Staff also found that since the panels are mounted on a hipped roof, the solar panels are more visible than they might be on a different roof form. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.
- e. The current request has seven less panels facing the street than the previous request. While the current proposal is more consistent with the Guidelines, the Guidelines are clear that panels should not negatively impact the rightof-way.
- f. The applicant is proposing to mount the panels flush with the pitched roof. This is consistent with Guidelines for Additions 6.C.ii, which states solar collectors should be flush with the roof surface.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends denial based on findings a through f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube denial based on staff findings.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Cone , Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2016-203

Applicant: Tyron Johnson/IES Co

Address: 631 MISSION ST

June 15, 2016

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a solar panel system onto the roof of the primary historic structure at 631 Mission Street. Within this request, the applicant has proposed the following:

1. Locate sixteen (16) panels in front of the side gable, visible from the public right of way on Mission Street.
2. Locate four (4) panels behind the side gable, hidden from the public right of way on Mission Street.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to mount a solar panel system at 631 Mission in the King William Historic District. The applicant has proposed to mount the solar panel system on the side (southeast) roof slope of the primary historic structure both in front of the side roof gable and behind the side roof gable.

b. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Additionally, solar collectors may be located on garages or other accessory structures where access to the primary structure is limited. The applicant has proposed to locate 16 of the solar panels on the street side of the existing side gable where they would be visible from the public right of way. This is not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. To the rear of the side roof gable, the applicant has proposed to locate 4 solar panels. This location is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i. Staff recommends the applicant propose to locate additional panels behind the roof gable.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of item #1.

Staff recommends approval of item #2. Additionally, staff recommends the applicant study placing additional solar panels behind the side gable or on the rear accessory structure.

Applicant withdrew request & will resubmit.

24. HDRC NO. 2016-199

Applicant: Irvin Hernandez

Address: 127 CALLAGHAN AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to place a new, twenty (20) foot long shipping container in the rear yard behind both the primary historic structure and an accessory structure at 127 Callaghan.

FINDINGS:

a. **MASSING & FORM** – The applicant has proposed to locate a pre-engineered shipping container in the rear yard at 127 Callaghan to the rear of both the primary historic structure and an accessory structure. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.i and ii. in regards to accessory structures, the design of accessory structures should be visually subordinate to the primary historic structure in terms of height, massing and form and should feature a footprint of no more than forty (4) percent of that of the primary historic structure. At approximately twenty (20) feet in length, eight (8) feet in width and eight (8) feet in height, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

b. **CHARACTER** – The Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii. states that new accessory structures should relate to the period of construction of the primary historic structure through the use of complementary materials and simplified architectural details. Staff finds that the simple, contemporary features of the proposed structure are appropriate. Staff recommends the applicant paint the shipping container to match the colors of the primary historic structure.

c. **WINDOWS & DOORS** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction, window and door openings should be similar in design to those found on historic accessory structures in the district or on the primary historic structure in terms of their spacing and proportions. The applicant has proposed four sliding glass doors and narrow horizontally oriented windows that span more than half of the structures rear façade. Given the

June 15, 2016

contemporary, industrial nature of the shipping container, staff finds these openings appropriate given that the applicant match window and door colors with those of the primary historic structure.

d. **ORIENTATION & SETBACKS** – The applicant has proposed to locate the accessory structure at the rear of the lot set back 18' – 9" from the west property line. The structure is placed immediately adjacent to the existing accessory structure. Generally, accessory structures in the Lavaca Historic District are located along a side and rear property line. The applicant's proposal to locate an accessory structure in the rear middle of the lot is not typical and generally is not consistent with the Guidelines in terms of setback from the property line. However, staff finds that this location is appropriate in this situation because the applicant is essentially proposing to place the structure in a way that reads as an addition to the existing accessory structure. Given this relationship to the existing structure, staff finds this placement appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through d with the stipulations that the shipping container, windows and doors feature colors that are matching to those of the primary historic structure

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Laffoon and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone , Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2016-216

Applicant: Todd Mernin

Address: 614 E CARSON

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof at 614 E Carson with a new standing seam metal roof. The applicant has proposed to install a colored roof which is noted to be "Patina Green".

FINDINGS:

a. The house at 614 E Carson was constructed circa 1900, is of the Folk Victorian architecture style and currently features an asphalt shingle roof. The applicant has requested to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof at 614 E Carson with a new standing seam metal roof. The applicant has proposed to install a colored roof which is noted to be "Patina Green".

b. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, metal roofs are to be used on structures where a metal roof is appropriate for the style or construction period. The installation of a standing seam metal roof on this structure is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

c. In regards to the proposed color of "Patina Green", the Historic Design Guidelines Checklist for Metal roofs notes that panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width should be used, that seams are 1 to 2 inches in height, that a crimped ridge seam that's historically appropriate be used, that a low profile ridge cap be used and that a galvalume finish be used; manufacturer's colors are not recommended.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

1. That a standard galvalume finish is used.
2. That panels that are 18 to 21 inches in width be used.
3. That seams are 1 to 2 inches in height.
4. That a crimped ridge seam that's historically appropriate or a low profile ridge cap be used.

June 15, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Salmon for approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone , Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2016-168

Applicant: Edward Hernandez/Open Studio USA

Address: 3006 BROADWAY

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install monument signage for the multi-tenant structure at 3006 Broadway to feature a total size of approximately 130 square feet.
2. Receive approval for general size and placement of wall mounted signs to be designed and installed when tenants have been secured.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant has proposed to install a monument sign at northern end of the lot at 3006 Broadway. The applicant has proposed a base of cut stone with a metal frame and metal exterior panels. The graphics will be routed out with translucent coatings with the address numbers featuring reverse lit channel letters. The applicant has noted that the cabinet itself will be internally lit. This signage is to be 10' – 8" in length by 6' – 0" in height for a total square footage of approximately 130 square feet. Given the location along Broadway and the multi-tenant nature of the structure, staff finds the additionally requested square footage appropriate

b. As previously mentioned, the new construction at 3006 Broadway will feature multiple tenants. The applicant has proposed a signage plan for the new construction to feature a wall mounted sign to front Broadway for each tenant and for one wall mounted sign to face E Mulberry for the corner tenant. Generally, staff finds this approach to signage appropriate given that an appropriate size and design are proposed.

c. The applicant has proposed for tenant signage space of up to forty-five (45) square feet for each wall sign fronting Broadway and the wall sign fronting E Mulberry. Staff finds that 45 square feet is excessive for the size of the tenant wall space of the new construction. Staff recommends the applicant reduce each tenant's signage space to no more than twenty (20) square feet for wall mounted signs. Additionally, staff finds that the proposed E Mulberry sign should be smaller in scale and design than the proposed Broadway signs.

d. The applicant is responsible for complying with the UDC Section 35-678 in regards to signage.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding a.

Staff recommends approval of item #2 based on findings b through c with the stipulation that signage to not exceed 20 square feet be installed fronting Broadway, that signage not exceeding 10 square feet be installed along E Mulberry and that each sign be approved by OHP staff prior to permitting and installation.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone , Salmon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

June 15, 2016

27. HDRC NO. 2016-203

Applicant: Austin Vaughn/Sign Crafters

Address: 201 E GRAYSON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a total of seventeen signs at 201 E Grayson. This signage request includes:

1. One (1) face lit channel letter wall sign reading "West Elm" featuring 25 square feet to be mounted on the west elevation. – Sign A
2. One (1) face lit channel letter wall sign reading "West Elm" featuring 14.25 square feet to be mounted on the south elevation. – Sign B
3. One (1) face lit channel letter raceway sign reading "West Elm" featuring 6.25 square feet to be mounted on the south elevation. – Sign C
4. One (1) face lit channel letter raceway sign reading "West Elm" featuring 14.25 square feet to be mounted at the entrance of the covered parking along the south elevation. – Sign D
5. One (1) internally illuminated blade sign reading "West Elm" featuring 12 square feet to be mounted on the east elevation. – Sign E
6. One (1) wall mounted sign reading "West Elm Customer Pick-Up" featuring 14 square feet to be mounted within the covered parking area. – Sign F
7. One (1) non-illuminated wall mounted sign reading "West Elm" featuring 6 square feet to be mounted within the covered parking area. – Sign R
8. Six (6) window clings reading "West Elm" featuring 1.58 square feet each to be mounted in the storefront windows on the east, south and west elevations. – Sign G

The applicant has proposed 10 signs which allowable per the UDC that aren't to be included in the total signage area requested. These signs are primarily for parking, restrooms, entrances and exits and are noted as H, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, and T.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed a total of seventeen (17) signs totaling approximately 150 square feet at 201 E Grayson located within the River Improvement Overlay.
- b. The applicant has noted that signs A, B, C and D are to be face lit channel letters featuring white LED lighting, which is to be located within the channel letters. The LED's will be diffused by white translucent acrylic faces. The channel letters themselves will be constructed of aluminum. The applicant's proposed signage is consistent with the UDC. In regards to each sign's size, the applicant has proposed varying sizes.
- c. Sign A is to be located on the west elevation and feature 25 square feet. Staff finds this sign's location appropriate, however, staff finds that its size should be comparable to signs B and D at 14.25 square feet.
- d. Sign B is to be located above an entrance door within the covered parking area. Staff finds this sign of 14.25 square feet and its location appropriate.
- e. Sign C is to be located above the E Grayson entrance and is to feature 6.33 square feet. Staff finds this sign and its location appropriate.
- f. Sign D is to be located near the entrance to the covered parking area and is to feature 14.25 square feet. Staff finds this sign's location and size appropriate.
- g. The applicant has noted that sign E is to be an internally illuminated blade sign to be internally illuminated by white LED's. The LED's will be diffused by white translucent acrylic faces. The channel letters themselves will be constructed of aluminum. Staff finds this signage appropriate given the location on the front façade as well as its design and overall size.
- h. Sign F is to be a non-illuminated wall sign which is to read "West Elm Customer Pick-Up". The applicant has

June 15, 2016

proposed this sign to be located on the northern most wall of the covered parking area, away from the public right of way. Given it's size of 14 square feet and its location, staff finds this sign appropriate.

i. The applicant has proposed a total of six (6) window clings reading "West Elm" featuring 1.58 square feet each to be mounted in the storefront windows on the east, south and west elevations. Staff finds these inappropriate given their placement near locations of lit signage.

j. Sign R is to be non-illuminated wall mounted sign reading "West Elm" featuring 6 square feet to be mounted within the covered parking area. Staff finds that this signage is appropriate given its placement, location and setting where it will not be highly viewable from the public right of way.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 with the stipulation that the applicant reduce the overall square footage to be consistent with the square footage of signs B and D based on finding a.

Staff recommends approval of items #2 through #7 as submitted based on findings c through i.

Staff does not recommend approval #8 based on finding j.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine for approval of items #2-#6 with staff stipulations, elimination of item# 7 & item# 8, return with drawings for item # 1.

AYES: Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone , Salmon, Brittain, Grube

NAYS: None

RECUSAL: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

Approval of Meeting Minutes – June 1, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Lazarine to approve June 1, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Laffoon, Lazarine, Cone, Salmon, Grube

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:13 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

